



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/500,958	08/23/2004	Alexander Shipp 117-514		1440	
23117 7	7590 01/10/2006		EXAMINER		
	ANDERHYE, PC	LEWIS, ALICIA M			
ARLINGTON	GLEBE ROAD, 11TH F , VA 22203	LOOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2164		

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N		on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summer:		10/500,95	8	SHIPP, ALEXANDER				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Alicia M. L		2164				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication r Reply	on appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR INTERIOR IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IS LONGER IN THE MAILING IN T	NG DATE OF TH CFR 1.136(a). In no evention. y period will apply and will by statute, cause the app	IIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tin Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	N. nety filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 23 August 2004						
	This action is FINAL . 2b) \boxtimes This action is non-final.							
,—	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
,	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application	ation.						
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
,	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers							
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Ex	caminer.						
• —	The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 July 2004</u> is/a		d or b)⊠ objected to I	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	oreign priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the			ed in this National	Stage			
	application from the International I	•						
* 9	see the attached detailed Office action for	r a list of the certi	fied copies not receive	ed. <i>Ac</i>	Shelle			
A 44	W-1				RIMELL Y EXAMINER			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)								
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)			Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO r No(s)/Mail Date	/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	Patent Application (PT	D-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/500,958 Page 2

Art Unit: 2164

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in United Kingdom on April 25, 2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 0309462.0 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 100, 200 and 300. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37

Application/Control Number: 10/500,958 Page 3

Art Unit: 2164

CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: element 1' in Figure 1B and elements 302 and 305 in Figure 3. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities: the word "and" is missing after the semicolon in line 3 of the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoefelmeyer et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0086499 A1) ('Hoefelmeyer').

With respect to claims 1 and 5, Hoefelmeyer discloses a content scanning system for electronic documents such as emails comprising:

- a) link analyzer (element 110 in Figure 1, paragraph 24 line 1) for identifying hyperlinks in document content (paragraph 24 lines 4-12);
- b) means for causing a content scanner (elements 122, 124 and 126 in Figure 1) to scan objects referenced by links identified by the link analyzer and to determine their acceptability according to predefined rules (paragraph 23 lines 12-15, paragraph 27 lines 1-6, paragraph 28, paragraph 29).

The latter portion of claim 1, which states:

"the means being operative, when the link is to an object external to the document and is determined by the content analyzer to be acceptable, to retrieve the external object and modify the document by replacing the link to the external object by one to a copy of the object stored on a trusted server"

is optional, thus it holds no patentable weight.

Art Unit: 2164

With respect to claims 4 and 8, Hoefelmeyer discloses wherein if any linked-to object is determined by the content scanner to be unacceptable the document is flagged or modified to indicate that fact (paragraph 29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 2-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoefelmeyer et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0086499 A1) ('Hoefelmeyer') in view of Lambert et al. (US Patent 6,629,138 B1) ('Lambert').

With respect to claims 2 and 6, Hoefelmeyer teaches claims 1 and 5.

Hoefelmeyer does not teach wherein the link analyzer a) and means b) are operative to recursively process links identified in such external objects.

Lambert teaches a method and apparatus for storing and delivering documents on the internet (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the link analyzer a) and means b) are operative to recursively process links identified in such external objects (column 9 lines 65-67).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hoefelmeyer by the teaching of Lambert

Art Unit: 2164

because wherein the link analyzer a) and means b) are operative to recursively process links identified in such external objects would enable a method to manage passive and active data throughout a network, and offer an improved method and apparatus for storing and delivering information on the Internet (Lambert, column 2 lines 23-26).

With respect to claims 3 and 7, Hoefelmeyer as modified teaches in which only a maximum depth of recursion is permitted and the document is flagged as unacceptable if that limit is reached (Lambert, column 10 lines 6-10).

According to Lambert's invention, the number of levels to search can be used as inclusion/exclusion criteria. Therefore, the maximum number of levels before stopping (maximum depth of recursion) can be used as a reason to exclude a page (or document); this exclusion is similar to flagging a document unacceptable.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/500,958 Page 7

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Lewis January 3, 2006